

These minutes are a summary of the discussion. The audible recording is available at the following website: <http://bit.ly/T3S7CB>

Planning & Zoning Commission Meeting
Minutes of February 6, 2013
1st Floor North Conference Room - City Hall

Present: Chairman Nathaniel Cannady, Vice-Chairman Jeremy Goldstein, Kristy Carter, Jane Gianvito Mathews and Holly P. Shriner

Absent: Mr. Joe Minicozzi and Mr. Paul Smith (who has resigned)

Pre-Meeting - 4:30 p.m.

The Commission began the pre-meeting by reviewing the agenda.

Regular Meeting - 5:00 p.m.

Chairman Cannady called the meeting to order at 5:00 p.m. and informed the audience of the public hearing process.

Administrative

- ? Ms. Mathews moved to approve the minutes of the January 2, 2013, meeting, with minor amendments. This motion was seconded by Ms. Carter and carried unanimously by a 5-0 vote.
- ? Ms. Carter moved to continue a request for conditional zoning for Carman Residence located at 191 Cumberland Avenue from RS-8 Residential Single Family High Density District and RM-8 Residential Multi-Family Medium Density District to Community Business I District/Conditional Zoning to March 6, 2013. This motion was seconded by Ms. Shriner and carried unanimously on a 5-0 vote.
- ? Chairman Cannady noted that the application for a subdivision modification to the access requirements for the property located at 389A Chunn's Cove Road has been withdrawn.

Agenda Items

- (1) Request to rezone property located at 152 Montford Avenue from RM-8 Residential Multi-Family Medium Density to NB Neighborhood Business District. The petitioner is Michael McDonough. The property is identified as PIN 9649-12-0436. Planner coordinating review – Blake Esselstyn.**

Urban Planner Blake Esselstyn oriented the Commission to the site location and said this is a one-sixth-acre site which occupies a corner lot at the high-profile Montford Avenue-West Chestnut Street intersection and contains a distinctive building. Buncombe County land records indicate there was a building on the property as early as 1907. The applicant asserts (but staff has not verified) that the original use was a dry goods store, followed by a grocery market. Other property records indicate that in 1972 the Pentecostal Tabernacle acquired the property and subsequently began to use it as a church.

Places of worship are a use by right (subject to special requirements) in the existing RM8 zoning district, but the applicant, who purchased the property this past December, is interested in pursuing other non-residential uses. Section 7-8-1 of the Unified Development Ordinance (UDO) provides that the proposed zoning district, Neighborhood Business (NB), can support, for example, offices, health and fitness facilities, eating and drinking establishments, and retail sales

(the latter two would be subject to special requirements). The district does not allow some uses allowed in other mixed-use districts however, such as banks, clinics, or funeral establishments.

Section 7-8-8 of the UDO sets forth the purpose of the proposed district:

The Neighborhood Business District is established to reserve areas for low-intensity business centers which are accessible to pedestrians from the surrounding residential neighborhood. The intent of the district is to provide for the daily convenience and personal service needs of the surrounding residential neighborhood while minimizing conflicts with surrounding residential uses. This district is designed to be located within or adjacent to residential neighborhoods where large commercial operations are inappropriate, but where small neighborhood oriented businesses are useful and desirable.

Since the property is currently surrounded by the same RM8 district, the proposed rezoning would establish a one-sixth acre, isolated zoning district. Elsewhere in the city, or with another zoning district, such a configuration might be discouraged or characterized as spot-zoning, but the NB district is intended for use in small “pockets,” and examples of small islands of NB zoning at intersections surrounded by residential zoning exist in multiple older Asheville neighborhoods. Indeed, perhaps most noteworthy, similar instances of small NB nodes can be found one long block north of the subject site (Nine Mile restaurant), and one long block south (Tod's Tasties).

If the zoning change is approved, there will likely be some design challenges for whatever use is pursued. The Neighborhood Business zoning would require a 20-foot wide landscape buffer against the adjacent RM8 zoning to the south and west, but the arrangement of the parking area, which is also currently used by the two adjacent properties for access to their own driveways/parking, would preclude installing such a buffer in its entirety, so some sort of alternative compliance would likely be sought. Further, the platted alley to the west of the lot is partially paved, but partially vegetated, and the driveway entrance doesn't align with the alley; while there are allowances for a driveway entrance to penetrate a buffer, a fully-compliant buffer would be problematic for the vehicular access not only to this property, but to the adjacent properties as well.

These landscaping challenges need not be considered in detail as part of this rezoning petition—the choices for how to address them will depend on the specific use proposed, as well as the design of the future site improvements. Staff in the transportation department has indicated that any transportation improvements will also depend on the proposed use. The intersection of Montford Avenue and West Chestnut Street is an unusual intersection where the east and west sections of West Chestnut are offset, and the section adjacent to this site has a stop sign, separate from the traffic signal controlling the other three arms of the intersection. A new use introducing a substantial increase in traffic could potentially trigger changes to the intersection or the signalization.

While these obstacles would confront a future commercial use, staff recognizes that the architecture (designed for retail/church use) could prove an awkward fit for re-use as a residence. Further, the Montford Historic District Design guidelines could limit how the building could be altered to accommodate a residential use. The Historic Resources Commission Director is aware of the rezoning petition and has indicated no opposition. The Montford Neighborhood Association is supportive of this rezoning.

Pros:

- ? Consistent with existing instances of Neighborhood Business zoning on same corridor.
- ? The Comprehensive Plan promotes adaptive reuse of such sites.
- ? Building architecture is better suited for commercial use than residential.

Cons:

- ? Challenges will likely exist for developer in meeting development standards for parking and landscaping.
- ? If use is changed to a low-impact use, site improvements other than buffers may not be required.

Staff feels that there is encouraging precedent for such nodes of Neighborhood Business zoning to work well along Montford Avenue. The building, originally designed for commercial use, doesn't appear to have ever primarily served as a home, and the 2025 Plan encourages repurposing such sites for non-residential use, "while ensuring that neighborhood compatibility and public safety goals are met." Staff finds the request is reasonable, is confident that existing standards will address the compatibility and safety goals, and recommends approval of the rezoning request.

Mr. Michael McDonough, applicant, said that because they purchased the property two months ago, at this time they have no specific intended use for it. They will talk to various parties and find a good fit for the area.

Chairman Cannady opened the public hearing at 5:10 p.m. and when no one spoke, he closed the public hearing at 5:10 p.m.

There was discussion, initiated by Ms. Mathews, regarding the challenges of parking for the proposed use. Mr. Esselstyn explained that there may be some tools available for permitted on-street parking for the neighborhood; however, a lot depends on the specific use of the site, e.g., if an office, a lot of parking would not be generated. Staff is hopeful that a relatively small building will not be generating a lot of parking. If the project comes through for Level I review, parking would be addressed at that time.

In response to Ms. Shriner, Mr. Esselstyn said that if any changes to the intersection are necessary due to increased traffic it would be the responsibility of the developer.

Based on the above findings and the analysis provided in the report, Vice-Chairman Goldstein moved to recommend approval of the rezoning of property located at 152 Montford Avenue. This motion was seconded by Ms. Carter and carried unanimously by a 5-0 vote.

(2) Major Subdivision review for the project identified as Lake Craig/Azalea Road Improvements located at 69 Gashes Creek Road. The subdivision proposes a new road, bridge, regional storm water management, greenway, stream restoration, and public parking. The owner is City of Asheville and the contact is Mike Lewis. The property is identified in the Buncombe County tax records as PIN 9668-22-0260, 9668-14-0551, and 9668-03-9619. Planner coordinating review – Julia Fields.

Urban Planner Julia Fields oriented the Commission to the site location and said the applicant, City of Asheville, is requesting preliminary plat/site plan review for a number of public infrastructure improvements to the Lake Craig/Azalea Road area including roadway/intersection improvements, waterline construction, a new road and bridge, parking, stream restoration, and stormwater improvements.

This project is considered a major subdivision pursuant to Section 7-5-8 of the City of Asheville Code of Ordinances.

The project affected area encompasses 11.40 acres on three parcels and existing roadways located off of Swannanoa River Road, Gashes Creek Road, and Azalea Road in East Asheville. The proposed project is the first phase of a two phase project to provide improved

access to city facilities and private properties along Azalea Road and Gashes Creek Road, provide a much needed water connection to the John B. Lewis Soccer Complex, and to provide additional flood protection for Biltmore Village and surrounding areas.

The City-owned properties are zoned RS-2 (Residential Single-Family Low Density District) and the affected roadway portions are partially zoned RM-8 (Residential Multi-Family Medium Density District) and RM-16 (Residential Multi-Family High Density District).

This project was reviewed by the Technical Review Committee (TRC) on January 7, 2013, and approved with conditions. This proposal either meets all technical standards as required by the City of Asheville and other agencies or has the ability to comply through minor revisions and clarifications. A variance will be needed for the Mama T's Building because the new roadway will make the front setback non-compliant for that building. They will be going to the Board of Adjustment at the March meeting requesting a front setback variance, which staff is supporting. Staff recommends they ask for a variance of 15 feet or a little bit more.

Ms. Mathews also pointed out that there is a need for handicapped parking at the Parks & Recreation facility. They are providing for bicycle parking, but it was recommended by the TRC that perhaps bicycle parking not be located at the buildings, but sprinkled throughout the development. They will be working with the Transportation Department on the best location for those facilities.

Staff recommends approval of the site plan and proposed development subject to the TRC conditions and the granting of the front setback variance by the Board of Adjustment.

Stormwater Services Manager McCray Coates explained that the proposal includes improvements to access to Azalea Park/JBL Soccer Complex including: improved intersections at Swannanoa River Road/Azalea Road and Azalea Road/Gashes Creek Road; providing sidewalks/pedestrian ways for access into the area; providing bike lanes into the area; and providing a one-way loop traffic pattern along a portion of Azalea Road and a newly developed roadway to reduce traffic conflicts which currently exist on the narrow Azalea Road. The proposal also includes a new water line to serve the soccer complex pavilion which currently does not have potable water. Parking areas are improved and expanded. A transit shelter is shown at the intersection of Swannanoa River Road and Azalea Road. This intersection is designed to accommodate a traffic signal in the future if determined to be warranted.

The development proposals continue to be under review by all pertinent state and federal agencies.

Plans are to begin the project in late summer or early fall of 2013. It should take 12 to 18 months to complete all elements.

Street trees are required along the new roadway proposed. Parking lot landscaping is required for the new parking area. The landscaping shown on the plans is compliant with City standards. Extensive stream restoration vegetation is planned following improvements to the river way.

Chairman Cannady opened the public hearing at 5:31 p.m.

A Haw Creek resident explained why he didn't feel that the City has done a good job in managing the property since they acquired it, specifically in terms of environmental, open space and habitat issues. He recommended that the City re-excavate Lake Craig to reduce the flooding.

Chairman Cannady closed the public hearing at 5:33 p.m.

In response to Vice-Chairman Goldstein, Mr. Coats explained why the recommendation to re-excavate Lake Craig is not part of this project.

In response to Ms. Carter, Mr. Coates said that staff is continuing their conversations with the N.C. Dept. of Transportation for improvements at the intersection on Swannanoa River Road.

When Vice-Chairman Goldstein asked the difference between Phase I and Phase II, Mr. Coates said that Phase I is in relation to the flood mitigation project. Phase II will be to rehabilitate the dam and look at it for flood control measures for a 25-50 year flood event. Phase II is not funded and there is no certainty of a timeframe.

When Ms. Shriner inquired about landscaping, Ms. Fields said that there will need to be a pretty extensive re-vegetation plan where the stream location and restoration is, which most will be regulated by the Corp of Engineers.

In response to Chairman Cannady, Mr. Coates said that they will be re-working the creek from below the dam. Above the dam they will be removing approximately 17,000 yards of materials.

When Ms. Shriner asked about dam maintenance, Mr. Coates said they expect the dam to be maintained annually.

In response to Ms. Shriner, Mr. Coates said they are still having conversations about the sidewalk width along Azalea Road between Gashes Creek Bridge and Swannanoa River Road.

Based on the above findings and the analysis provided in the report, Vice-Chairman Goldstein moved to recommend approval of the major subdivision for the Lake Craig/Azalea Road improvements located at 69 Gashes Creek Road subject to the conditions outlined by the Technical Review Committee, and the variance for the front setback. This motion was seconded by Ms. Mathews and carried unanimously by a 5-0 vote.

(3) Amendment to the UDO to consider to the Central Business District zone to provide clarifications for two-story requirements for new construction and to allow one-story additions to existing buildings. Planner coordinating review – Alan Glines.

Urban Planner Alan Glines said that this is the consideration of an amendment to Chapter 7 of the Code of Ordinance to provide additional clarification for two-story requirements for new construction and allowances for one-story additions to existing buildings and for accessory structures.

The most recent changes to the regulations governing the Central Business District were adopted in November 2010; based on the recommendations from the *Downtown Master Plan*. When the master plan was created in 2008 and 2009, most new development projects were expected to be larger with construction of new multi-story structures. Since that time, primarily due to the economic downturn and reduction of business activity, new development has occurred but has primarily been on a more limited scale. While we are seeing a pickup of interest in larger scale projects, the interest in these smaller projects continues and we have observed that certain aspects of the adopted regulations are somewhat problematic for those projects. The greatest interest has been in renovating existing one-story buildings or expanding and adding to these buildings, primarily in areas that surround the traditional downtown core.

Preservation of historic buildings is an identified goal of the master plan and these projects help to preserve buildings and make them feasible for reuse by extending their functional life. The challenge we are seeing is that new one-story construction is not allowed in the central business district zone and therefore variances have been required for a number of these additions which are often one-story like the existing building. As this issue has been studied and

considered after reviewing four recent variances, proposed clarifications for two-story buildings, one-story additions and setback requirements have been identified related to a certain type of situation described below.

For new construction the building is expected to be close to the frontage line of the parcel but additional setbacks are allowed for courtyard spaces, dining uses and other lawn areas for residential and institutional uses. Yet when an addition is contemplated it is with a specific activity in mind to make the commercial endeavor function more effectively and the normal setback rules can be difficult to meet since (for example) a kitchen is not usually desired at the front of a building or parcel but placing a kitchen addition at the rear of the property requires a variance. Thus in cases where the existing building may not meet one or more setbacks, the addition will often require a variance since it can't be placed to meet the standards. The proposed wording amendment has been drafted to address these fairly common scenarios.

Variances have their place to act as relief from standards in an ordinance for unexpected or unusual hardships. When the requested variances are common enough to seem repetitive, and we see that relief is usually granted, a wording change correcting the problem may be needed. One additional factor about the variance process is that it represents a delay for the developer of at least two months and because a variance process is quasi-judicial in review, the final outcome is uncertain. It is with this background that the wording amendment is proposed.

Summary of Proposed Changes:

Two-story height- The CBD requires that new buildings be constructed to two-stories. The wording change specifies a dimension in feet so that the actual height requirements will be understood. The proposed amendment also clarifies that the second story could cover the full first floor footprint area; but may also only cover a portion of the main floor (as in the instance of a mezzanine or atrium space). In these situations the second floor area is to be placed at the frontage line of the parcel to enhance the building character experienced along the street. There is no proposed amendment to allow single-story buildings 'by right'. If there is a true hardship in meeting this basic requirement a variance could be requested.

One-story additions- Additions represent economic and financial investment and are common when a property is renovated. The proposed wording amendment recognizes that additions are anticipated and will be more appropriate in situations where they do not overwhelm the scale of the existing building. This amendment limits the size of the additions covered by the ordinance and provides placement options (setback parameters) relating to the existing building.

Accessory structures- The existing ordinance permits accessory structures in the central business district but is not clear where on the lot they are allowed. The proposed wording amendment will provide clarity on placement of accessory structures. Commonly accessory structures are single-story and are placed at the rear of the parcel for storage or specific activities. Restaurants have at times been permitted accessory structures in the form of a covered outdoor dining space. For this situation the proposed amendment would allow such accessory structures to be placed at the front of the lot since they generally enhance the activity at the sidewalk.

Street Wall substitution- For new construction in downtown, a two-story (or more) *street wall* is required. Recently, there was a conflict with this requirement in a situation where an existing one-story building was being preserved and a larger addition was being added as a part of the project. Because of the way the standard is worded in the UDO the existing single-story section of the project did not meet the street wall definition and requirement. The proposed amendment will correct this scenario for single story existing buildings that are identified as a contributing structure in the downtown national register district that will be preserved as a part of a development proposal. This amendment will also support other goals of the Downtown Master Plan including preservation of the historic building stock and City adopted goals for sustainability.

Setback flexibility for additions- Existing buildings in downtown are 'grandfathered' in the locations they are found which sometimes include non-compliant setbacks (zero setbacks are the basic standard in the CBD). When buildings undergo renovation they may be upgraded to comply with current building standards defined in the building code but the placement of a building is never questioned regarding its compliance with setback rules. For parcels that have space to build an addition, the usual setback standards apply to the addition too and can pose an unexpected challenge. Additions are attached to the existing building where they are needed and depending on their proposed function, the internal layout of the existing building or in some cases the building's orientation.

The proposed amendment would provide some relief from this situation which currently requires the approval of a hardship variance. As was noted before, additions are common and even encouraged for the continued vitality of downtown and for the long term viability of individual buildings which furthers the goals of historic preservation.

Other Central Business District areas: West Asheville- For the other Central Business Districts such as the two areas found in west Asheville, there are similar development standards like those in place for downtown. There have been a number of renovations of existing buildings but until now few additions. The proposed amendments also make practical sense for these CBD areas and will assist when additions to existing structures are proposed. The information was shared with some representatives of the Haywood Road Corridor Study Group and although the number of comments back were limited, all were positive to the idea of the proposed amendment. As the proposal for a Form Based Code gets underway for Haywood Road, recommendations for changes may be identified and brought forward adoption.

This action complies with (1) the City Council Strategic Operating Plan goals of implementing community adopted plans with reasonable regulations to assure a balanced approach to managing the community's resources and encouraging redevelopment and continued investment; (2) the Downtown Master Plan: The Downtown Master Plan provided a framework to ensure that the downtown is protected and that the environment is enhanced and continues to grow and prosper. This amendment aligns with the broader goals of the plan such as business investment and preservation of the existing building stock; and (3) the Haywood Road Plan: The Haywood Road Plan is currently in draft form but the amendment will support and identified goal to preserve existing historic buildings along the corridor and especially structures within the two national register districts. The proposed amendments recognize the value of existing structures and removes an impediment for renovation and expansion for new and existing businesses.

The Downtown Commission reviewed the proposed amendment at their meeting on December 14, 2012 and unanimously endorsed the amendment (Vote 11-0 to recommend approval). Although the Haywood Road Corridor Study Group has suspended regular meetings, the amendment was shared with them for comment and while the responses were limited, the seven comments that were received were positive about the proposal.

Pros:

- ? Allows the ordinance to adapt to current trends and opportunities
- ? Removes a deterrent to continued investment in key areas of the city
- ? Maintains reasonable standards to maintain the community's character

Cons:

- ? The nature of some ordinances is such that they require review and adjusting over time

City staff recommends Planning and Zoning Commission approve the amendments to the UDO as described in the staff report and ordinance.

After talking with Mr. Joe Minicozzi earlier, Mr. Minicozzi iterated the importance of the two-story standard and closing any loopholes that might allow a mostly one-story building to be built (because the two-story represents a lot of investment in the downtown area). He also felt that he could justify a separate standard if they had a very large base floorplate and the second story was only a portion of that - something like 20,000 square feet. In a building that size, at least 50% could be a second story. Mr. Minicozzi relayed that he didn't want the mezzanine to substitute for a second floor just to satisfy that requirement. They can have a mezzanine, if they provided a full floor above that. He also felt that civic uses should have a pass on the two-story standard. With this conversation in mind an amendment incorporating these changes would look something like this the following alternative amendment Section 7-8-18 (f) (7) to add a new section (a) below:

- "(a) The two story requirement for new construction will mean that:
1. A second story is provided as a full occupied floor and a mezzanine level or atrium level will not be deemed to meet this requirement; and
 2. If the ground floor area is at least 20,000 sq ft, then a partial second story of at least 10,000 sq ft may be provided, or
 3. Civic uses such as places of worship, arena, auditoriums, government buildings and performance centers will not be required to meet the two-story standards."

Ms. Mathews recalled asking for the inventory of historic buildings that contribute to downtown. She questioned why we aren't just focusing on the historic buildings that we want to preserve as part of the character of the City and making accommodations for those being reused and adapted.

After discussion initiated by Ms. Mathews, it was the consensus of the Commission to add the definitions, from the State Building Code, of mezzanine (which is not defined as a second story - it is a portion of a story in which it is contained ...) and atrium (which is an opening connecting two or more stories ...) to the proposed ordinance.

Ms. Shriner noted that the whole purpose of this ordinance amendment is to encourage more density in downtown.

Mr. Glines pointed out that another clarification amendment to the proposed ordinance is that the height for new structures in the Central Business District will be a minimum of 20 feet for two stories.

After discussion, it was the consensus of the Commission to delete in the alternative language number (2) "If the ground floor area is at least 20,000 sq ft, then a partial second story of at least 10,000 sq ft may be provided, or", and then amend the alternative language as follows:

- "(a) The two story requirement for new construction will mean that:
1. A second story is provided as a full occupiable floor (and a mezzanine level will not be deemed to meet this requirement); and
 2. Civic uses such as places of worship, arena, auditoriums, government buildings and performance centers will not be required to meet the two-story standards."

Mr. Glines pointed out that Section 7-8-18 (g) (7) (a) will be adjusted to be close to the amended alternative language in Section 7-8-18 (f) (7) (a) so that it applies to west Asheville as well.

At 6:11 p.m., Chairman Cannady opened the public hearing.

Mr. Michael McDonough, representing the Downtown Commission, said that the alternative language was developed after they met. He felt that government buildings should be removed from the list of civic uses that will not be required to meet the two-story standards. He supported the deletion of the original (2) in the alternative language.

At 6:14 p.m., Chairman Cannady closed the public hearing.

Ms. Mathews felt the 20 feet minimum height for new structures in the Central Business District for two stories seemed to be low. She suggested the minimum height should be at least 24 feet.

It was the consensus of the Commission to amend Section 7-8-18 (f) (7) and Section 7-8-18 (g) (7) to reflect a minimum of 24 feet for two stories for new structures in the Central Business District.

Ms. Mathews asked for clarification on whether the Commission should vote on the draft with the amendments or whether the draft (with the amendments made) should come back before the Commission before a final vote. Assistant Planning & Development Director Shannon Tuch felt that in other wording amendments staff didn't finalize the standards and there was continued discussion and debate about what the actual standards should be. She felt this is more of a formatting correction. If the Commission would like to postpone action until they see the final draft, staff will bring it forward again in another month.

Mr. Glines outlined the consensus amendments as follows to the draft before the Commission:

1. Section 7-8-18 (f) (7) be revised to add the new section (a) below:

"(a) The two story requirement for new construction will mean that:

1. A second story is provided as a full occupiable floor (and a mezzanine level will not be deemed to meet this requirement); and
2. Civic uses such as places of worship, arena, auditoriums, and performance centers will not be required to meet the two-story standards."

2. Section 7-8-18 (g) (7) be revised to add the new section (a) below:

"(a) The two story requirement for new construction will mean that:

1. A second story is provided as a full occupiable floor (and a mezzanine level will not be deemed to meet this requirement); and
2. Civic uses such as places of worship, arena, auditoriums, and performance centers will not be required to meet the two-story standards."

3. Add the definitions, from the State Building Code, of mezzanine (which is not defined as a second story - it is a portion of a story in which it is contained ...) and atrium (which is an opening connecting two or more stories ...) to the proposed ordinance.
4. Amend Section 7-8-18 (f) (7) and Section 7-8-18 (g) (7) to reflect a minimum of 24 feet for two stories for new structures in the Central Business District.

At the suggestion of Ms. Mathews, it was the consensus of the Commission to revise the third "Whereas" in the ordinance to reflect that new construction is required to be "a minimum of" two stories ...; and the fifth "Whereas" in the ordinance to reflect "... what is expected with the minimum two-story requirement".

Associate City Attorney Jannice Ashley said that the Commission has agreed to the changes outlined above. She suggested Mr. Glines revise the proposed ordinance and send the final draft to the Commissioners.

Based on the above findings and the analysis provided in the report, Ms. Shriner moved to recommend approval of amending Chapter 7 of the Code of Ordinance to the Central Business District zone to provide clarifications for two-story requirements for new construction and to allow one-story additions to existing buildings with the amendments outlined, including the amendments to the two "Whereas"s. This motion was seconded by Vice-Chairman Goldstein and carried unanimously on a 5-0 vote.

Other Business

Chairman Cannady announced the next meeting on March 6, 2013, at 5:00 p.m. in the First Floor Conference Room in the City Hall Building.

Planning & Development Director Judy Daniel announced the Commission's retreat on March 8.

Adjournment

At 6:26 p.m., Ms. Shriner moved to adjourn the meeting. This motion was seconded by Vice-Chairman Goldstein and carried unanimously on a 5-0 vote.